



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,134	07/24/2001	Patrick Willem Hubert Heuts	NL 000425	4012
24738	7590	07/26/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS 1109 MCKAY DRIVE, M/S-41SJ SAN JOSE, CA 95131			TRAN, KHANH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/912,134

Applicant(s)

HEUTS ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Tran

Art Unit

2631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 10 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed on 05/13/2005 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-10 are pending in this Office action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 5 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 1, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --; in line 1, "Whilst" should be changed to -- while --. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 2, "whilst" should be changed to -- while --. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 2, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --. Appropriate correction is required.

6. Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 1, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --; in line 2, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --; in line 4, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --; in line 5, "CAN" should be changed to -- Controller Area Network --. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1 and 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders et al. U.S. Patent 5,933,459.

Regarding claim 1, in column 5, lines 10-40, figure 4 shows a state machine in a receiver including first and second comparators 410(a) and 410(b), a multiplexer 420, and a latch 310.

In column 1 line 55 via column 2 line 17, Saunders et al. teaches a dual reference voltage receiver that includes comparison logic, a latch, and voltage selection logic that is coupled to the latch and the comparison logic. The comparison logic compares a current line voltage level 322 and provides an indication of a voltage state for a received data signal relative to an operative reference voltage, e.g. Vref1 or Vref2. The latch 310 receives the voltage state

indication and couples it to its output in response to a timing signal (clock), and the voltage selection logic selects the operative reference voltage from the first and second reference voltages, according to the voltage state indication at the latch output.

In light of the foregoing disclosure, the latch 310 corresponds to the claimed storage element. The clock corresponds to the claimed local transmission indicator. And the voltage state indication corresponds to the claimed thresholded version of the comparison. The output of latch 310 is retro-coupled to the input of latch 310 through. MUX 420.

Saunders et al. does not expressly teach a reception indicator signal as claimed in the application claim. In column 2, lines 1-13, Saunders et al. further teaches the comparison logic provides an indication of a voltage state for a received data signal relative to an operative reference voltage. The latch receives the voltage state indication and couples it to its output in response to a timing signal, and the voltage selection logic selects the operative reference voltage from the first and second reference voltages, according to the voltage state indication at the latch output. In light of the foregoing teachings, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized the interchangeability of the indication of a voltage state as taught by Saunders et al. for the reception indicator signal as specified in the application claim. Motivation is the indication of a voltage state for a received data signal as taught in Saunders et al. invention.

Regarding claim 3, referring to figure 4, the retrocoupling is through MUX 420 while the non-retrocoupling feeds the clock or strobe.

Regarding claim 4, referring to figure 4, latch 310 is edge-triggered.

Regarding claim 5, in the background of the invention, column 1, lines 5-55, Saunders et al. invention is directed to the field of data transmission, and in particular to systems and methods for reliably determining the voltage level of data signals transmitter at high speed on 32-bit buses in computers and other data processing devices. In view of that, Saunders et al. receiver in figure 4 can be used in bus organization that has multiple transmission stations as claimed in the application claim.

Regarding claim 6, claim 6 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 7, claim 7 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 5 because of similar scope. The receiver in figure 4 corresponds to the claimed station.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. Claims 9-10 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is allowed over the cited prior art because the cited references cannot teach or suggest the method of operating a CAN communication line as set forth in the application claim.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Drawing U.S. Patent 6,262,602 B1 discloses "Incident-Edge Detecting Probe".

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-3007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 08:00 AM - 05:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2631

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KCT

*Khanhcong Tran*

07/22/2005

Examiner KHANH TRAN